

To: Honorable Chairperson and

Members of the Boundaries

Commission

From: Pedro Velar, Assistant Director

Incorporation and Annexation

**Date:** March 2, 2004

Subject: Fontainebleau Area Proposed

Incorporation

# **BACKGROUND**

The Fontainebleau Area Municipal Advisory Committee (MAC), a group of Fontainebleau-area residents appointed by the Board of County Commissioners, was created under the sponsorship of Commissioner Souto to review the concerns raised by both members of the County Commission and County staff and the manner in which those concerns may be alleviated in the event that Fontainebleau is incorporated as a municipality. The group met for fifteen (15) months with the support of County staff, to complete its charge assessing the fiscal feasibility and desirability of incorporating the area into its own municipality.

The Fontainebleau area is required by County Code to remain in the Miami-Dade Fire-Rescue District, the Miami-Dade Public Library System, the County's solid waste collection system and continue to receive and pay for specialized law enforcement services from the Miami-Dade Police Department in perpetuity and to contract with the County for local patrol police services for a minimum of three years. The Conceptual Agreement between the County and the Fontainebleau MAC addresses these issues and establishes the terms under which the area may proceed with incorporation.

# **INCORPORATION REPORT**

The County Code, Section 20-23(b) and Section 20-30(b) contain a set of guidelines that the Boundaries Commission, the Planning Advisory Board, and the County Commission are to consider in developing their recommendations and actions on an incorporation proposal. These guidelines were developed with the intent of assuring both that the proposed new city is fiscally viable and that the potential negative impact of the creation of the new city on the remaining unincorporated municipal service area (UMSA) is minimized.

This report provides the information required by the Miami-Dade County Code.

# **SUMMARY OF PETITION**

The petitioners have stated that they wish to form a new municipality for the following reasons:

- to increase and improve the level of public safety;
- to improve local parks and recreation services;
- to improve public area maintenance;
- to improve other basic public services;
- to improve the process of development regulation; and
- to provide for enhanced public participation in local government.

## PROFILE OF THE AREA

The estimated 2000 population of the area is 25,448 persons. Table 1 reports selected demographic and economic characteristics of the area. Overall, compared to the County as a whole, the median household income and the per-capita income of the Fontainebleau area are lower. The population in the Fontainebleau area is predominantly of Hispanic origin with very few blacks, non-Hispanic residents.

Table 1
Social and Economic Characteristics
Fontainebleau MAC Area and Miami-Dade County

i Officialisticad mixto Arca al	ia manii baac	County		
Fontainebleau Miami-Dade				
Population Characteristics, 2000	25,448	2,253,362		
Percent White, Not Hispanic	11.3	20.7		
Percent Black, Not Hispanic	1.3	19.0		
Percent Other, Not Hispanic	3.5	3.0		
Percent Hispanic Origin	83.9	57.3		
Income				
Median Household Income	\$33,654	\$35,966		
Per-capita Income	\$16,116	\$18,497		
Housing				
Percent Owner Occupied	45.1	57.8		
Percent Single Unit detached	4.0	42.7		

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Miami-Dade County Department of Planning and Zoning, 2004.

Table 2, provides additional demographic information.

Table 2
Fontainebleau MAC Area
Population by Race & Hispanic Origin
Miami-Dade County, 2000

	main bado county, boo				
	Total	White Not	Black Not	Other Not	Hispanic Origin
Tract	Persons	Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic	Any Race
90.11	8,966	806	40	128	7,992
90.12	12,195	1,697	239	659	9,600
90.15	4,287	381	43	101	3,762
Total:	25,448	2,884	322	888	21,354
Percent:	100%	11.3%	1.3%	3.5%	83.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Miami-Dade County Department of Planning and Zoning, 2004.

# Development Profile of the Area

Table 3 reports the 2000 land use profile of the area. Residential, roadways/communication, and park and recreation uses comprise approximately 80 percent of the proposed incorporation area.

Table 3
Fontainebleau MAC Area

2000 Land Uses

2000 Edita OSCS								
	Fontainebleau	Fontainebleau	Miami-Dade County	Miami-Dade County %				
Land Use	(Acres)	(%)	(Acres)					
Residential	. 318.1	28.8	99,385.4	6.4				
Commercial	22.9	2.1	13,776.1	0.9				
Industrial	NA	NA	17,200.2	1.1				
Institutional	61.5	5.6	12,950.6	8.0				
Parks/Recreation	307.1	27.8	787,907.6	50.9				
Roadways/Communication/Utilities	291.8	26.5	86,065.5	5.6				
Agricultural	0.0	0.0	80,355.3	5.2				
Undeveloped	10.0	0.9	135,421.9	8.7				
Inland/Costal Waters	91.5	8.3	315,654.7	20.4				
Total:	1,102.9	100.0	1,548,717.3	100.0				

Source: Miami-Dade Department of Planning and Zoning, Research Section, Jan., 2004

### **GUIDELINES ANALYSIS**

The following analysis addresses the factors required for consideration by the Boundaries Commission, Planning Advisory Board and Board of County Commission pursuant to Chapter 20 of the County Code.

- 1. The suitability of the proposed boundaries to provide for a municipal community that is both cohesive and inclusive. Specifically, the area should:
  - a) Not divide a Census Designated Place, to the extent feasible.

The proposed incorporation area is entirely located inside the Fontainebleau Census Designated Place (CDP) which is an officially recognized traditional community. However, approval of the proposed incorporation would result in a divided Fontainebleau CDP. Specifically, the easternmost, westernmost and southern portions of the Fontainebleau CDP would remain in unincorporated Miami-Dade County.

b) Include adjacent areas of ethnic minority and lower income residents in which a majority of those residents have so petitioned.

No adjacent unincorporated areas have a majority of ethnic minority or lower income residents that have petitioned to be in the incorporation area.

c) Have contiguity and not create any unincorporated enclave area(s). An unincorporated enclave area is defined as an area that would be 1) surrounded on more than (80) percent of its boundary by one (1) or more municipalities and of a size that could not be serviced efficiently or effectively.

The proposed incorporation area is not an enclave nor approval of the proposed boundaries would result in the creation of an enclave.

d) Have natural or built barriers as boundaries, to the extent feasible.

The proposed incorporation area is bounded on the north by State Road 836/Dolphin Expressway, on the east by NW 87 Avenue, on the south by West Flagler Street, and on the west by NW 107 Avenue. The above referenced boundaries are logical and consist of existing features.

2. Is there evidence of support of area residents and property owners sufficient to warrant the costs of balloting of electors?

As required by the resolution establishing the Fontainebleau MAC, three public hearings were held on January 9, 2003, February 20, 2003, and December 18,

2003 to discuss the proposed incorporation of Fontainebleau. The Fontainebleau MAC members took the citizen attendance and comments at the public hearings and regularly scheduled MAC meetings under advisement in making their recommendation.

3. What are the existing and projected property tax costs for municipal-level services to the average homeowner in the area as currently unincorporated and as incorporated as a comparable Miami-Dade County city with a similar per-capita property tax base?

The proposed incorporation area of the Fontainebleau has a per capita taxable value of approximately \$19,891. While the governing body of the proposed Cities in Miami-Dade County with similar per capita taxable values to the proposed incorporation area are found below with their corresponding millage rates:

CITY	PER CAPITA TAXABLE VALUE	MILLAGE RATE
Sweetwater	\$17,093	3.4487
El Portal	\$20,768	8.7
Homestead	\$21,624	8.5
UMSA	\$50,000	2.447

The per capita taxable value for the proposed incorporation area at \$19,891 is lower than that for the Unincorporated Municipal Service Area (UMSA), at approximately \$50,000. The millage rate for UMSA is 2.447, substantially lower than the millage rates for comparable municipalities.

4. Are there any suitable alternatives to incorporation, including incorporation to an existing municipality?

The proposed Fontainebleau incorporation area's southwestern boundary is in common with that of the City of Sweetwater. The proposed incorporation area could be annexed by Sweetwater however the City has not expressed formal interest in doing so.

5. Is the area totally contained in the Urban Development Boundary depicted on the future land use map of the Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan?

The entire proposed incorporation area is located inside the 2005 Urban Development Boundary of the County's Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP). The County's Land Use Policy 2B states that "priority in the provision of services and facilities and the allocation of financial resources for services and facilities in Miami-Dade County shall be given first to serve the area within the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) of the 2005-2015 Land Use Plan Map (LUP)."

# 6. Consistency with the Land Use Plan of the County's Comprehensive Development Master Plan.

The future land use designations within the proposed incorporation area are "Business and Office," "Office/Residential," "Low-Medium Density Residential," "Medium Density Residential," and "Parks and Recreation." A brief description of these CDMP land uses follows:

The "Business and Office" land use designation accommodates the full range of sales and service activities. Included are retail, wholesale, personal and professional services, commercial and professional offices, hotels, motels, hospitals, medical buildings, nursing homes, entertainment and cultural facilities, amusement and commercial recreation establishments. Residential uses, and mixing of residential use with commercial, office and hotels are also permitted in Business and Office designated areas provided that the scale and the intensity, including height and floor area ratio of residential or mixed use development, is not out of character with that of adjacent or adjoining development and zoning.

The "Office/Residential" land use designation allows both professional and clerical offices, hotels, motels, and residential uses. Office development may range from small-scale professional office to large-scale office parks.

The "Low-Medium Density Residential Communities" land use designation allows residential uses at a density of 5 to 13 dwelling units per gross acre. The "Medium Density Residential Communities" land use designation allows residential uses at a density of 13 to 25 dwelling units per gross acre. Both residential land use designations may allow activities associated with residential areas such as institutional and recreational uses, water bodies, group homes, hotels and utilities.

The "Parks and Recreation" land use designation includes both private and public lands in park or recreation use.

# 7. Is the proposed municipality compatible with existing planned land uses and zoning of the areas surrounding the proposed municipality?

The current land uses in the proposed incorporation area are roadway/communication facilities, residential single- and multi-family, commercial, office, institutional and parks. These current uses are consistent with the planned land uses in the Land Use Plan Map of the CDMP. The underlying zoning would also permit consistent development of the area. Planned land uses and zoning within the proposed incorporation area are compatible with the planned land uses and zoning of the area that surrounds it.

Honorable Chairperson and Members Board of County Commissioners Page 7

8. What is the impact of the proposal on the revenue base of the unincorporated area and on the ability of the County to effectively and efficiently provide services to adjacent remaining unincorporated areas?

County staff conducted a financial analysis to determine the impact incorporation of this area will have on the UMSA budget. As part of this analysis, staff calculated revenues derived from and expenses incurred in the proposed incorporation area. It is estimated that the incorporation of the Fontainebleau area will result in the loss of approximately \$5.42 million in UMSA revenues and a reduction of approximately \$2.7 million in UMSA expenses, for a net loss to the County of approximately \$2.72 million. This means the proposed incorporation of Fontainebleau will have a negative impact on the remaining unincorporated area. The Boundaries Commission should be aware that proposed minimum police staffing is estimated at \$3.6 million which is \$2.2 million greater than the local patrol police figure of \$1.4 million included in the Estimated Revenues and Expenses Impact to the UMSA Budget. Finally, County staff has recommended a mitigation payment of \$721,807 from the City to the County which represents 1.501 mills from their assessed 2002 tax rolls.

The figures listed below in the Fontainebleau MAC Estimated Revenues and Expense Impact to the UMSA Budget are calculated using ratios based on the fiscal year 2002 – 2003 budget for each support function to the total direct services budget, which includes Police, Public Works and Parks.

The assumptions do not include; gas tax funded projects, canal maintenance revenues or expenses, proprietary activities such as building, zoning, and solid waste; and fire and library districts. The revenues and expenditures are based on allocations not on actuals.

2002-03 UMSA Millage Police Calls for Service for 2002 Cost per Police Call Cost per Lane Miles Number of Lane Miles Per Capita Taxable Value S19.86 Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA  Property Tax Revenue Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & millage Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on soll/population Sales Tax Sales Tax Sales Tax Allocation based on soll/population Sales Tax Sales Tax Sales Tax Allocation based on soll/population Sales Tax Sales Tax Sales Tax Sales Tax Allocation based on soll/population Sales Tax Sal	Fontainebleau	Based	A	
25,44 2002-03 UMSA Millage 2002-03 UMSA 2002-03	on FY 02-03 Budget		Assumptions	
25,44 2002-03 UMSA Millage 2002-03 UMSA 2002-03				
2.42 Police Calls for Service for 2002 Cost per Police Call Cost per Lane Mile Number of Lane Miles Per Capita Taxable Value  Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA Property Tax Revenue Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & millage Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on \$0.21 per person Allocation based on \$0.21 per person Allocation based on \$0.27 per person Allocation based on \$0.27 per person Allocation based on \$0.57 per person \$167,00 Interest Allocation based on \$0.57 per person \$20,00 Allocation based on \$0.80 per person \$20,00 Allocation based on \$0.80 per person \$20,00 Franks and Recreation Dept Public Works  Lane Road Miles Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Direct cost times 9.3% Direct cost times 9.3% \$198,90 Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on \$0.80 per person \$20,00	2002 Taxable Property Rolls			\$506,193,761
Police Calls for Service for 2002 Cost per Police Call Cost per Lane Mile Number of Lane Miles Per Capita Taxable Value  S19,88  Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA  Property Tax Revenue Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & millage Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Alcondilo Beverage License Allocation based on tax roll/population Alcondilo Beverage License Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population S00,00 Communications Tax Allocated based on tax roll/population Allocation based on \$29 per person Allocation based on \$21 per person Allocation based on \$0,21 per person Allocation based on \$1,70 per person Allocation based on \$1,70 per person Allocation based on \$1,70 per person Allocation based on \$2,70 per person Allocation based on \$2,70 per person Allocation based on \$2,70 per person Allocation based on \$5,70 per person Allocation based on \$5,70 per person Allocation based on \$5,80 per person S10,00  Gross Revenue to UMSA S5,423,00  Gross Revenue to UMSA S5,423,00  Gross Revenue to UMSA Lane Road Miles Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support Direct cost times 9.3% S198,90 Direct cost times 9.3% S198,90 Direct cost times 5.3% S198,90 Direct cost time	2000 Census Population	•	1	25,448
Cost per Police Call Cost per Lane Mile Number of Lane Miles Per Capita Taxable Value S19,88  Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA  Property Tax Revenue Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & millage Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on \$0.21 per person Allocation based on \$0.21 per person S5,00 Cocupational License Allocation based on \$0.57 per person Allocation based on \$0.57 per person Allocation based on \$0.58 per person Allocation based on \$0.58 per person Allocation based on \$0.58 per person S10,70 Interest Allocation based on \$0.80 per person S20,00 Gross Revenue to UMSA  Cost of Providing UMSA Services Police Department Based on police calls Local Patrol Specialized & Other Specialized & Other Specialized & Other Specialized & Other S11,401,91 S515,88 S180,37 Public Works  Lane Road Miles Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Direct cost times 9.3% S119,35 Cost of Providing UMSA Services \$2,701,30	2002-03 UMSA Millage	•		2.447
Cost per Lane Mile Number of Lane Miles Per Capita Taxable Value  Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA  Property Tax Revenue Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & millage Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocation based on \$0.21 per person Sales Tax Allocation based on \$0.21 per person Allocation based on \$0.37 per person Sales Tax Allocation based on \$0.37 per person Sales Tax Allocation based on \$0.57 per person Sales Tax Allocation based on \$0.57 per person Sales Tax Allocation based on \$0.57 per person Sales Tax Sales Tax Allocation based on \$0.57 per person Sales Tax Sales	Police Calls for Service for 2002			9,599
Number of Lane Miles  Per Capita Taxable Value  S19,88  Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA  Property Tax Revenue Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & miliage Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Special to tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/po	Cost per Police Call			\$200
Number of Lane Miles  Per Capita Taxable Value  S19,88  Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA  Property Tax Revenue Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & miliage Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Special to tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/po	Cost per Lane Mile			\$1,380
Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA  Property Tax Revenue Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & miliage Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on \$59 per person Allocation based on tax roll/population Franchise Fees Allocation based on \$59 per person Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Franchise Fees Allocation based on \$50 per person Franchise Fees Allocation based on \$50 per person Franchise Fees Allocation based on \$50 per person Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Franchise Fees Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Franchise Fees Franchise Fra	•			29.44
Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA  Property Tax Revenue Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & miliage Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on \$59 per person Allocation based on tax roll/population Franchise Fees Allocation based on \$59 per person Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Franchise Fees Allocation based on \$50 per person Franchise Fees Allocation based on \$50 per person Franchise Fees Allocation based on \$50 per person Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Franchise Fees Franchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll/population Franchise Fees Franchise Fra	· .			
Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA  Property Tax Revenue Pranchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & miliage Allocation based on tax roll/population \$434,00 \$5ales Tax Allocation based on \$59 per person Allocation based on tax roll/population \$1,433,00	Per Capita Taxable Value			\$19,891
Property Tax Revenue Property Tax Revenue Pranchise Fees Allocation based on tax roll & millage Allocation based on tax roll/population \$434,00 \$434,0				
Franchise Fees Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on \$59 per person S1,493,00 Allocation based on tax roll/population Communications Tax Allocated based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population S906,00 Alcoholic Beverage License Allocation based on \$0.21 per person Allocation based on \$3.17 per person Allocation based on \$5.57 per person Allocation bas	Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA		STATES OF THE ST	
Franchise Fees Sales Tax Allocation based on tax roll/population Sales Tax Allocation based on \$59 per person S1,493,00 Allocation based on tax roll/population Communications Tax Allocated based on tax roll/population Allocation based on tax roll/population S906,00 Alcoholic Beverage License Allocation based on \$0.21 per person Allocation based on \$3.17 per person Allocation based on \$5.57 per person Allocation bas	D	. •		M4 477 000
Sales Tax Utility Taxes Allocation based on \$59 per person Allocation based on tax roll/population Allocated based on tax roll/population Allocated based on tax roll/population Allocation based on \$0.21 per person Allocation based on \$0.21 per person Allocation based on \$3.17 per person Allocation based on \$3.17 per person Allocation based on \$6.57 per person Allocation based on \$5.57 per person Allocation based on			<del></del>	
Utility Taxes Communications Tax Allocated based on tax roll/population Alcoholic Beverage License Allocation based on \$2.7 per person Allocation based on \$3.17 per person Allocation based on \$3.17 per person Allocation based on \$3.17 per person \$81,00 Allocation based on \$3.17 per person Allocation based on \$5.7 per person Allocation based on \$5.87 per person Allocation based on 5.3% of all revenues Allocation based on \$0.80 per person Allocation based on \$0.80 per person Allocation based on \$0.80 per person \$20,00  Gross Revenue to UMSA  Cost of Providing UMSA Services Police Department Based on police calls  Local Patrol Specialized & Other Based on cost of parks \$11,401,91 \$515,88 \$180,37  Public Works  Lane Road Miles Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support  Direct cost times 5.3%  Cost of Providing UMSA Services \$2,701,30	,			
Allocated based on tax roll/population \$906,000 Alcoholic Beverage License Allocation based on \$0.21 per person \$5,000 Alcoholic Beverage License Allocation based on \$0.21 per person \$5,000 Alcoholic Beverage License Allocation based on \$0.21 per person \$167,000 Allocation based on \$0.21 per person \$167,000 Allocation based on \$0.27 per person \$167,000 Allocation based on \$0.57 per person \$167,000 Allocation based on \$0.80 per person \$20,000 Allocation based on \$0.80				
Alcoholic Beverage License Occupational License Fines and Forfeitures Interest Allocation based on \$3.17 per person Allocation based on \$6.57 per person Allocation based on \$6.57 per person Allocation based on \$5.00 Interest Allocation based on \$6.57 per person Allocation based on \$5.00 Allocation based on \$0.80 per person \$20,00 Gross Revenue to UMSA  Cost of Providing UMSA Services Police Department Based on police calls  Local Patrol \$11,401,91 Specialized & Other				
Occupational License Fines and Forfeitures Interest Allocation based on \$3.17 per person \$167,00 \$167,				•
Fines and Forfeitures Interest Miscellaneous Revenues Allocation based on \$6.57 per person Allocation based on .53% of all revenues \$29,00 \$20,00 \$20,00 \$32,00 \$410 cation based on \$0.80 per person \$20,00			1	\$5,000
Interest Miscellaneous Revenues Allocation based on .53% of all revenues \$29,000 Gross Revenue to UMSA  Cost of Providing UMSA Services Police Department Based on police calls  Local Patrol \$1,401,91 Specialized & Other \$515,88 Parks and Recreation Dept Public Works  Lane Road Miles  Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support  Cost of Providing UMSA Services  \$29,00 \$20,00 \$52,00 \$52,00 \$52,00 \$52,00 \$52,00 \$52,00 \$53,00 \$54,23,00 \$5	•		· ·	\$81,000
Allocation based on \$0.80 per person \$20,00  Gross Revenue to UMSA \$5,423,00  Cost of Providing UMSA Services Police Department Based on police calls  Local Patrol \$1,401,91 Specialized & Other \$515,88  Parks and Recreation Dept Based on cost of parks \$180,37  Public Works  Lane Road Miles Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others Direct cost times 9.3% \$198,90  QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Direct cost times 11.7% \$250,23  Policy Formulation/Internal Support Direct cost times 5.3% \$113,35  Cost of Providing UMSA Services \$2,701,30	·	•	1	\$167,000
Cost of Providing UMSA Services Police Department  Based on police calls  Local Patrol Specialized & Other \$1,401,91 Specialized & Other \$180,37 Public Works  Lane Road Miles Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support  Cost of Providing UMSA Services  \$5,423,00 \$5,423,00 \$11,401,91 \$515,88 \$180,37 \$180,37 \$198,90 Direct cost times 9.3% \$198,90 Direct cost times 9.3% \$198,90 Direct cost times 11.7% \$250,23 Direct cost times 5.3% \$113,35			l e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	\$29,000
Cost of Providing UMSA Services Police Department  Based on police calls  Local Patrol \$1,401,91 Specialized & Other \$515,88 Parks and Recreation Dept Public Works  Lane Road Miles  Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support  Cost of Providing UMSA Services  Planning UMSA Services  Sased on police calls  Local Patrol \$1,401,91 Specialized & Other \$515,88 Sased on cost of parks Signal \$180,37 Signal \$180,37 Signal \$180,37 Signal \$180,37 Signal \$198,90 Direct cost times \$1.7% Signal \$198,90 Direct cost times \$11.7% Signal \$198,90 Direct cost times \$11.7% Signal \$198,90 Direct cost times \$1.7% Signal \$198,90	Miscellaneous Revenues		Allocation based on \$0.80 per person	\$20,000
Cost of Providing UMSA Services Police Department  Based on police calls  Local Patrol \$1,401,91 Specialized & Other \$515,88 Parks and Recreation Dept Public Works  Lane Road Miles Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support  Cost of Providing UMSA Services  Planning UMSA Services  Based on police calls  Local Patrol \$1,401,91 Specialized & Other \$515,88 Sased on cost of parks  \$180,37 Direct cost times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Direct cost times 9.3% Signal Support \$198,90 Direct cost times 11.7% Signal Support \$250,23 Direct cost times 5.3% Signal Support \$250,23 Signal Support \$25	Gross Revenue to UMSA			\$5,423,000
Police Department    Local Patrol   \$1,401,91     Specialized & Other   \$515,88     Parks and Recreation Dept   Based on cost of parks   \$180,37     Public Works   Lane Road Miles   Lane miles times cost per lane mile   \$40,62     Planning, Team Metro and others   Direct cost times 9.3%   \$198,90     QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go)   Direct cost times 11.7%   \$250,23     Policy Formulation/Internal Support   Direct cost times 5.3%   \$113,35     Cost of Providing UMSA Services   \$2,701,30				
Police Department    Local Patrol   \$1,401,91     Specialized & Other   \$515,88     Parks and Recreation Dept   Based on cost of parks   \$180,37     Public Works   Lane Road Miles   Lane miles times cost per lane mile   \$40,62     Planning, Team Metro and others   Direct cost times 9.3%   \$198,90     QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go)   Direct cost times 11.7%   \$250,23     Policy Formulation/Internal Support   Direct cost times 5.3%   \$113,35     Cost of Providing UMSA Services   \$2,701,30	Cost of Providing UMSA Services		The property of the second sec	
Local Patrol \$1,401,91 Specialized & Other \$515,88 Parks and Recreation Dept Based on cost of parks Public Works  Lane Road Miles Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others Direct cost times 9.3% \$198,90 QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Direct cost times 11.7% \$250,23 Policy Formulation/Internal Support Direct cost times 5.3% \$113,35  Cost of Providing UMSA Services \$2,701,30	Police Department		Based on police calls	
Parks and Recreation Dept Public Works  Lane Road Miles  Lane miles times cost per lane mile  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support  Cost of Providing UMSA Services  Specialized & Other \$515,88  Based on cost of parks \$180,37  Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Direct cost times 9.3% \$198,90  Direct cost times 11.7% \$250,23  Direct cost times 5.3% \$113,35				\$1,401,912
Parks and Recreation Dept Public Works  Lane Road Miles  Lane miles times cost per lane mile  \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support  Cost of Providing UMSA Services  Based on cost of parks \$180,37  Lane miles times cost per lane mile \$40,62  Direct cost times 9.3% Direct cost times 9.3% Direct cost times 11.7% \$250,23  \$113,35		•	·	\$515,888
Public Works  Lane Road Miles  Lane miles times cost per lane mile  \$40,62  Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support  Cost of Providing UMSA Services  Lane miles times cost per lane mile  \$40,62  Direct cost times 9.3%  Direct cost times 9.3%  \$198,90  Direct cost times 11.7%  \$250,23  Direct cost times 5.3%  \$113,35	Parks and Recreation Dept		l i	\$180,371
Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support  Cost of Providing UMSA Services  Direct cost times 9.3%  Direct cost times 11.7%  Direct cost times 5.3%  \$198,90  \$250,23  Direct cost times 51.7%  \$113,35				
Planning, Team Metro and others QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Policy Formulation/Internal Support  Cost of Providing UMSA Services  Direct cost times 9.3%  Direct cost times 11.7%  Direct cost times 5.3%  \$198,90  \$250,23  Direct cost times 51.7%  \$113,35	L.	ane Road Miles	Lane miles times cost per lane mile	\$40,627
QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Direct cost times 11.7% \$250,23 Policy Formulation/Internal Support Direct cost times 5.3% \$113,35  Cost of Providing UMSA Services \$2,701,30			•	, -1.
QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go) Direct cost times 11.7% \$250,23 Policy Formulation/Internal Support Direct cost times 5.3% \$113,35  Cost of Providing UMSA Services \$2,701,30	Diamina Tona Makes and all		Diverse of the second states of the second s	<b>6400.000</b>
Policy Formulation/Internal Support Direct cost times 5.3% \$113,35  Cost of Providing UMSA Services \$2,701,30	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•		
Cost of Providing UMSA Services \$2,701,30				
	Policy Formulation/Internal Suppo	ort	Direct cost times 5.3%	\$113,356
	Cost of Providing UMSA Services	- !		\$2,701,302
Net Budget Loss to UMSA \$2,721,69				
MEL DRUGEL EUGG 10 UNIA   DZ./21,09	Not Rudget Lace to LIMCA			' ¢0 704 600
[·	not budget 2000 to Ollion			ΨΖ, εΖ 1,030

#### Assumptions:

- 1. Does not include gas tax funded projects
- 2. Does not include canal maintenance revenues or expenses
- 3. Does not include proprietary activities: Building, Zoning, Solid Waste
- 4. Does not include Fire and Library Districts
- 5. Revenues are based on allocations not actuals

## 9. CURRENT SERVICE LEVEL INFORMATION

### Background:

The Fontainebleau proposed incorporation area encompasses an approximately 1.72 square miles. The population estimate; based on 2000 census figures, is 25,448.

## **Police Services**

Calls for Service: The Doral District is comprised of 476 grids. The proposed incorporation area is made up of 8 Doral District Grids. The figures below represent calls for service for the Fontainebleau District, versus the proposed incorporation area of the Fontainebleau.

<u>Fontainel</u>	<u>bleau Prop</u>	osed Inco	orporation		<u>Doral</u>	<u>District</u>
2000	2001	2002		2000	2001	2002
10,802	10,551	9,599	•	168,003	176,490	168,272

Based on the aforementioned figures for calendar years 2000, 2001, and 2002, the Fontainebleau area represents 6.4, 5.9, and 5.7 percent, respectively, of the service demands for the Doral District.

Base Staffing: The proposed area of incorporation represents approximately 6 percent of the total calls for service for the district. Based on this percentage alone, minimum staffing requirements for the area would be **25 officers**. This staffing level does not account for supervisory or investigative concerns. The following represents minimum staffing levels needed to service the area, providing for viable response times, supervisory, officer safety, and relief concerns:

Base Staffing Level	
Captain	0
Lieutenants	1 ·
Sergeants	5
Officers	25
Detectives	2
Total Sworn	33
Public Service Aid (PSA)	2
Police Crime Analyst (PCA)	1
Police Records Specialist (PRS)	2
Secretary	1
DES	1
Office Support Specialist II (OSS)	1
Total Non-Sworn	88
TOTAL STAFF	41

#### SHIFT CONFIGURATION

City Commander / Lieutenant (1)
Secretary (1)

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Days GIU/Admin	<u>Platoon I</u> Midnights	<u>Platoon II</u> Days	<u>Platoon III</u> Afternoon	<u>Relief</u>
Sergeant (1) GIU Detectives (2)	Sergeant (1) Officer (8)	Sergeant (1) Officer (8) PRS (1)	Sergeant (1) Officer (9) PRS (1)	Sergeant (1)
CAU		PSA (1)	PSA (1)	
PCAS (1) DES (1)				
OSS2 (1)		•	•	

This shift configuration calls for officers on each shift to have different days off to allow for relief coverage. There would not actually be eight officers on any given day providing road patrol coverage.

The aforementioned minimum staffing configurations do not reflect equipment or specialized service concerns. They represent base staffing for the area based on size (square miles), population density, and calls for service.

Final staffing levels will be determined by contract after negotiations with elected officials. However, personnel levels shall not be set below the base staffing levels.

## Fire-Rescue Services

Incorporation will have no impact on the remainder of the Fire Rescue District since the proposed municipality will remain in the Fire District. The Fontainebleau MAC has addressed this issue in its conceptual agreement with the County.

# **Community and Economic Development**

The incorporation of the Fontainebleau Area could potentially have an impact on the County's Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) entitlement. Based upon an initial review of the proposed area of incorporation, block groups 90.12.2 and 90.13.3 are low and moderate income block groups which are eligible for CDBG funds.

## **Consumer Services Department**

The proposed incorporation will not have an impact on the department's ability to license and enforce cable TV regulations. The proposed incorporation will continue to be served by the same cable television and telecommunication operators as before.

Telecommunications service providers are required to register with the County only if they have facilities located within the unincorporated area. The purpose of the registration process is to determine users of the County's right-of-way. The new municipality will be responsible for managing its public thoroughfares and therefore companies that have facilities only within the proposed Fontainebleau incorporation area will no longer be required to register with the County.

Municipal programming is accomplished through separate agreements between municipalities and the cable operators providing services within their respective municipality. The cable operator's obligation to broadcast municipal meetings is outlined in these agreements. Technically, cable operators have the ability to add municipal programming to the proposed annexed areas if required.

## **Department of Environmental Resource Management**

- 1. Services provided by DERM on the subject areas include, but are not limited to:
  - I. Review and approval or disapproval of development orders.

This includes the following:

- Building Permits
- Zoning Actions
- Platting Actions (Land Subdivision)
- Building Occupancies (Residential and Nonresidential)
- Municipal Occupational Licenses

The department reviews applications for consistency with the requirements of Chapter 24. The review includes but is not limited to the following:

- Protection of public potable water supply wellfields
- Potable water supply
- Liquid waste disposal
- Stormwater management and disposal
- Tree resources preservation and protection
- Wetland preservation and protection
- Coastal resources preservation and protection
- Air quality requirements
- Flood protection
- II. Operating Permits:

Section 24-35 of the Code Authorizes DERM to require permits for any facility that could be a source of pollution. This includes a wide

variety of nonresidential activities or facilities and some ancillary operations to residential land uses.

III. Pollution Prevention and Educational Programs:

The DERM Office of Sustainable Environment and Education (OSEE) is responsible for promoting and coordinating pollution prevention programs, waste minimization programs, urban CO2 reduction and environmental education in general. The head of OSEE is Mr. Julio Calle and if you need additional information regarding these services you may contact him at (305-372-6828).

#### IV. Enforcement Activities:

These include regular inspections of permitted facilities as well as of any potential source of pollution, responses to complaints and general enforcement operations.

- Inasmuch as DERM's regulatory activities are enforceable under County Code in both incorporated and unincorporated area, the Department currently provides the above services to the subject area. Accordingly, annexation of the parcels in question will not affect our Department's ability to provide adequate levels of service.
- 3. The ability of DERM to provide adequate services to the areas being annexed will not be impaired in any manner by this action nor to the areas adjacent to the parcels being annexed.

The following information is being submitted as relates to Code requirements enforced by DERM. Additionally, we are submitting information concerning wellfields in the area as well as Water and Sewer, Tree Preservation, Wetlands and Stormwater information.

# Drainage:

#### Permitting:

DERM has delegated authority from the South Florida Water Management District for issuance of surface water management general permits under Chapter 40E-40, FAC. Jurisdiction to require a general permit is countywide, and is dependent upon the size of the development. DERM has also countywide permitting authority for the construction of overflow outfall to a body of water. Although some smaller projects may be exempted from drainage permits from DERM, it is still required for DERM to perform an environmental and water quality review for all new drainage system. Usually a tracking system is created by the Municipality to require DERM comments before issuing a construction permit.

### Canal issues:

The Miami – Dade County Water Control Plan shows existing Secondary Canals within the proposed incorporation area, in Section 4 -54-40 and in Gov't Lot 4, 53/54-40.

It is the responsibility of the city to prohibit any construction within the canal reservations, canal easements or canal right-of-ways without the necessary prior approval from DERM.

Furthermore, all secondary canals within the service area of the city will require a canal maintenance agreement between the City and the County. This allows the County's Public Works Department (PWD) to continue its maintenance activities in those canals, and maintain a standard level of service for the city's residents.

#### Hazardous Waste:

A database search was conducted to identify sites with current or historical contamination issues. The sites listed below were identified:

Permit	Permit #	Facility Name	Address			
IW5	2963	CLEAN LAUNDRY SERVICE, LLC	10686	NW	7	SŢ
IW5	2729	DRY CLEAN USA	9533	W	<b>FLAGLER</b>	ST
AW	235	FONTAINEBLEAU GOLF COURSE	9155	W	FLAGLER	ST
UT	3795	FONTAINEBLEAU GOLF COURSE	9155	W	FLAGLER	ST

### **Building Department**

The Building Department operates from fees collected by permits, inspections and fines related to the construction and renovation of property. The current permitting activity of the Fontainebleau area represents less than 1% of the permits issued by the Building Department and the associated revenues generated from those permits represent less than 1% of the total Building Department collections. Should the Fontainebleau area incorporate and establish it's own Building Department, the impact to the Miami-Dade County Building Department collection of revenue would be minimal, with no impact to the Department's ability to efficiently and effectively provide services to the remaining Unincorporated areas. On the other hand, should the Fontainebleau area choose to contract with this Department for the permitting services, the Department would continue to provide said services under the same conditions established for the transition period, with no adverse effect to our operations or service levels.

#### **Team Metro**

The code enforcement responsibilities of Team Metro will be transferred to the new municipality. Team Metro would be interested in discussing subcontracted code enforcement services within its area of expertise to the new municipality.

Honorable Chairperson and Members Board of County Commissioners Page 14

### Parks and Recreation

There is one (1) local park within the proposed incorporation boundaries, Ruben Dario Park.

The park will be transferred to the new municipality contingent upon UMSA residents being able to use the park without being required to pay fees for services above those charged to municipal residents. The net annual cost of operating this park is \$180,371 per year.

There is one (1) countywide park within the proposed incorporation boundaries, The Women's Park. This park will continue to be managed, operated and funded by the County.

#### **Solid Waste**

In accordance with Ordinance No. 96-30, solid waste collection service to residential units will continue to be provided by the Department of Solid Waste Management in the same manner as it is currently provided. Accordingly, there would be no impact on the Department's ability to provide waste collection service either to the adjacent or remaining unincorporated service area effectively and efficiently.

#### Water and Sewer

The proposed incorporated area is within the water and sewer service areas of Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department (WASD) and service is being provided to portions of the area. Future water and sewer service customers within the incorporated area would receive service from WASD. WASD would own, operate and maintain any future facilities, whether constructed by the City or by private developers. Adequacy and capacity of the County's water and sewer systems are dependent upon the type and timing of the development or redevelopment proposed to occur within the City. The incorporation would have no impact on WASD's ability to provide services to the remaining unincorporated area in the vicinity.

# <u>Transit</u>

Miami-Dade Transit is regional and provides services to municipalities as well as unincorporated areas.

# 10. Potential Revenue Sources and Facilities to be made available to the proposed municipality upon incorporation.

All the eligible municipal revenues will be available to the Fontainebleau Incorporation Area. It is also anticipated that police services will be made available from the Doral District Station. The park to be conveyed by Miami-Dade County in as-is condition to the proposed municipality of Fontainebleau is Ruben Dario park. The park will be transferred to the newly incorporated city contingent upon UMSA residents being able to continue to use the park without being required to pay fees for services above those charged to municipal residents.

Honorable Chairperson and Members Board of County Commissioners Page 15

11. Financial impacts of the incorporation on the remaining unincorporated areas of Miami-Dade County. Does the proposed incorporation fall between \$20,000 and \$48,000 per capita taxable value?

The Fontainebleau Incorporation Area per capita taxable value does not fall between \$20,000 and \$48,000. The per capita taxable value is \$19,891. It is anticipated that there will be no impact to the remaining UMSA should the Fontainebleau Area incorporate.

12. Any other factor that arises by virtue of any special or unique circumstances of a given area.

The existence of several facilities of countywide significance within the boundaries of the proposed incorporation area is a factor that arises as a unique set of circumstances. Facilities of countywide significance are those that are necessary for the coordinated current and future use of lands and development and service delivery throughout the County. The services provided by these resources are needed by the greater community. Therefore jurisdiction over these facilities will be retained by Miami-Dade County. In the proposed incorporation area the following facilities of countywide significance exist:

# DEPARTMENT/FACILITY WATER AND SEWER DEPARTMENT

Regional Pump Station 28 Regional Pump Station 114 Regional Pump Station 121

Regional Pump Station 27

Regional Pump Station 26

Regional Pump Station 113

PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT
The Women's Park

## LOCATION

800 NW 97 Avenue 680 NW 97 Avenue 10450 Fontainebleau Boulevard 9401 Fontainebleau Boulevard 8901 Fontainebleau Boulevard 290 NW 97 Avenue

Flagler Street and 103 Court

13. Will the area, if currently qualified, continue to be eligible for any benefits derived from inclusion in federal or state enterprise zones, or targeted area assistance provided by federal, state and local government agencies?

It is not anticipated that the incorporation will change the eligibility of the Fontainebleau area to avail itself of existing government funded programs, however, the new municipality will be responsible for pursuing such funding independent of the County.

# 14. Will creation of a new municipality impact public safety response times?

The new municipality will be contracting with MDPD for patrol services for a minimum of three years with a one year transition. Since the personnel assigned to the Fontainebleau Area will be working within the municipal boundaries exclusively, absent a need for mutual aid, response times in the area should be consistent with what they currently are. In general, incorporation of the area is not anticipated to have a significant effect on the County's ability to provide services to the adjacent remaining unincorporated areas.

The new municipality will also remain in the Fire District.

15. Will creation of a new municipality introduce barriers to municipal traffic circulation due to existing security taxing districts, walled communities, and/or private roads?

It is not anticipated that incorporation of the Fontainebleau area will introduce any new barriers to municipal traffic flow.

16. If the area has been identified by the federal government as a flood zone or by emergency planners as an evacuation zone, has the proposed municipality indicated its preparedness to address any extraordinary means that may arise?

The proposed incorporation area is located outside both the FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain and the County's designated evacuation zones.

17. Will municipal government offices and commercial centers be connected by public transportation?

The location of government offices will be determined by the elected municipal officials. However, currently there are four existing transit routes in the area some with connections to Metrorail, Government offices and shopping malls.

18. To the degree possible, would the proposed incorporation area be contained in one or more school district boundaries governing admission to elementary, middle and high school as the adjoining municipality?

The area is contained within the same school district boundaries as the adjoining area. The schools are Charles R. Hadley Elementary, E. W. Stirrup Elementary, John I. Smith Elementary, Ruben Dario Middle, and Miami Coral Park High Schools. As shown in Table 4, the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) utilization rates of Miami Coral Park Senior High, 137 percent, and of John I. Smith, 118 percent, are higher than the acceptable utilization rate of 115 percent.

Table 4 Schools Serving the Fontainebleau MAC Area				
School	Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) Capacity Utilization Rate* (Percent)			
Charles R. Hadley Elementary	88			
E. W. Stirrup Elementary	86			
John I. Smith Elementary	118			
Ruben Dario Middle	89			
Miami Coral Park High	137			

<sup>\*</sup> As agreed with the School Board, the acceptable FISH utilization rate by Miami-Dade County is 115 percent until the year 2005. Beyond 2005 the acceptable utilization rate decreases gradually to 100 percent by the year 2015.

Source: Information compiled by the Miami-Dade County Department of Planning and Zoning.

cc: Alex Munoz, Assistant County Manager Jennifer Glazer-Moon, Director Designate, Office of Strategic Business Management

# Fontainebleau MAC Estimated Impact on UMSA Budget Revenues and Expenses

	Ton Dauget Nevenues and Expenses	
Fontainebleau	Assumptions	
Based on FY 02-03 Budget		
2002 Taxable Property Rolls		\$506,193,761
2000 Census Population		25,448
2002-03 UMSA Millage		2.447
Police Calls for Service for 2002		9,599
Cost per Police Call		\$200
Cost per Lane Mile		\$1,380
Number of Lane Miles		29.44
Per Capita Taxable Value		\$19,891
Gross Revenue Loss to UMSA		
Property Tax Revenue	Allocation based on tax roll & millage	¢4 477 000
Franchise Fees	Allocation based on tax roll & miliage Allocation based on tax roll/population	\$1,177,000
Sales Tax	Allocation based on \$59 per person	\$434,000 \$1,493,000
Utility Taxes	Allocation based on \$59 per person  Allocattion based on tax roll/population	
Communications Tax		\$1,111,000
Alcoholic Beverage License	Allocated based on tax roll/population Allocation based on \$0.21 per person	\$906,000
Occupational License		\$5,000
Fines and Forfeitures	Allocation based on \$3.17 per person	\$81,000
Interest	Allocation based on \$6.57 per person	\$167,000
Miscellaneous Revenues	Allocation based on .53% of all revenues	\$29,000
miscenarieous Nevenues	Allocation based on \$0.80 per person	\$20,000
Gross Revenue to UMSA		\$5,423,000
Cost of Providing UMSA Services		
Police Department	Based on police calls	
	Local Patrol	\$1,401,912
	Specialized & Other	\$515,888
Parks and Recreation Dept	Based on cost of parks	\$180,371
Public Works		-
Lane Road Miles	Lane miles times cost per lane mile	\$40,627
Planning, Team Metro and others	Direct cost times 9.3%	\$198,908
QNIP (Debt and pay-as you-go)	Direct cost times 11.7%	\$250,239
Policy Formulation/Internal Support	Direct cost times 5.3%	\$113,356
Cost of Providing UMSA Services		\$2,701,302
Net Budget Loss to UMSA		\$2,721,698
Value of 1.501 mills		¢701 907
		\$721,807
Revised: August 7, 2003	4	
Assumptions:		
Does not include gas tax funded projects		
2. Does not include canal maintenance revenues or ex	xpenses	
3. Does not include proprietary activities: Building, Zor	ning. Solid Waste	
4. Does not include Fire and Library Districts		
5. Revenues are based on allocations not actuals		
The second of th	UMSA Policy Analysis and Servi	ioos Planning Un

UMSA Policy Analysis and Services Planning Unit August 7, 2003